

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1-20 stand rejected. Applicant is amending claims 1, 10, and 19.

Applicant acknowledges the objections to the abstract and the claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed April 25, 2006 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed.

The Office Action alleges that two cited references (U.S. Patent Nos. 4,874,784 and 4,981,766) do not have the correct date and/or inventor's name. Applicant is filing a Supplemental IDS with the corresponding information. Applicant requests consideration of all cited references.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 10, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding independent claims 1, 10, and 19, the Office Action states (Page 3):

Examiner wonders which category of feedback applicants are claiming? Is it administrative category of educational or both? In the case applicants are claiming administrative category then which one since the specification discloses there are three additional administrative [categories] of feedback. What exactly are they?

The specification, as originally filed, discloses (Page 14, line 38 – page 16, line 16. Emphasis added.):

In the ICAT model of feedback, there are four levels of severity of error and four corresponding levels of feedback. The tutor goes through the student's work, identifies the severity of the error and then provides the corresponding level of feedback.

Educational Categories of Feedback			
ERROR		FEEDBACK	
Error Type	Description	Feedback Type	Description
None	No errors exist. The student's work is perfect.	Praise	Confirmation that the student completed the task correctly. Example: Great. You have journalized all accounts correctly. I am happy to see you recognized we are paying for most of our bills "on account".
Syntactic	There may be spelling mistakes or other syntactic errors. As a designer, you should be confident that the student will have mastered the material at this point.	Polish	Tells the student the specific actions he did incorrectly, and possibly correct them for him. Example: There are one or two errors in your work. It looks like you misclassified the purchase of the fax as a cash purchase when it is really a purchase on account.
Local	A paragraph of a paper is missing or the student has made a number of mistakes all in one area. The student clearly does not understand this area.	Focus	Focus the student on this area of his work. Point out that he does not understand at least one major concept. Example: Looking over your work, I see that you do not understand the concept of "on account". Why don't you review that concept and review your work for errors.
Global	The student has written on the wrong subject or there are mistakes all over the student's work	Redirect	Restate the goal of the activity and tell the student to review main concepts and retry the activity. "There are lots of mistakes throughout your work. You need to think about what type of transaction

			each source document represents before journalizing it."
--	--	--	--

When all syntactic mistakes were corrected, the tutor would return praise and restate why the student had written the correct paper. Focusing on the educational components of completing a task is not enough. **As any teacher knows, student will often try and cheat their way through a task. Students may do no work and hope the teacher does not notice or the student may only do minor changes in hope of a hint or part of the answer. To accommodate these administrative functions, there are three additional administrative categories of feedback. The administrative and the educational categories of feedback account for every piece of feedback a designer can write and a student can receive.** To provide a better understanding of how the feedback works together, an example is provided below.

As disclosed above, the present specification discloses that both administrative categories and educational categories are examples of feedback categories. Also, as disclosed above, exemplary administrative categories can be directed to 1) the student cheating through a task, 2) the student no work with the hope that the teacher does not notice, and 3) the student doing minor changes in hope of a hint or part of the answer. Figure 9 provides an exemplary screenshot, in which a student has not provided any work in a response. Also, as shown in the above table, educational categories of feedback include "Praise," "Polish," "Focus," and "Redirect." Applicant believes that the specification, as originally filed, addresses all of the questions posed by the Office Action. Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1, 10, and 19.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-20 are rejected by the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,311,422 (Loftin) in view of "Accounting and Financial Fundamentals for Non Financial Executives" (Rachlin).

Regarding claim 1, Applicant is amending the claim to include the features of "evaluating progress toward the goal and providing a determined feedback having a feedback category based on an appropriate level of feedback and an appropriate training component that further motivates accomplishment of the accounting goal, the appropriate level of feedback being selected from the plurality of feedback levels based on **an error severity of an associated response** from the student, the appropriate training component being selected from a plurality of training components and based on **an amount of work contained in the associated response**, and further comprising: (e)(i) **determining the type of the feedback category for the associated response;** (e)(ii) **when the feedback category corresponds to an administrative category, instructing the student to provide a sufficient amount of work to assess a subsequent**

response; and (e)(iii) when the feedback category corresponds to an educational category, assessing the associated response in accordance with the educational category.” (Emphasis added.) The amendment is supported by the specification as originally filed, e.g., page 14, line 38 – page 16, line 16 and as illustrated in Figure 9.

Regarding claim 1, the Office Action alleges that Loftin discloses (Page 5.):

... evaluating progress toward a goal (col. 6, lines 55-59) and providing a determined feedback having a feedback category (col. 12, lines 57-65, col. 14, lines 5-6. Examiner interprets diagnose the nature of the error, and sensitive to the skill level of the trainee as feedback category) based on an appropriate level of feedback (col. 14, lines 8-9) and an appropriate training component (col. 16, lines 31-43) that further motivates accomplishment of the accounting goal (col. 6, lines 55-59), the appropriate level of feedback being selected from the plurality of feedback levels based on an error severity of an associated response from the student (col. 14, lines 8-16), the appropriate training component being selected from a plurality of training components and based on an amount of work contained in the associated response (col. 16, lines 31-43) ...

The Office Action alleges that Loftin discloses “the appropriate level of feedback being selected from the plurality of feedback levels based on an **error severity of an associated response** from the student.” (Emphasis added.) As alleged by the Office Action, Loftin discloses (Column 14, lines 7-16.):

As a result, the detail and tone of error messages are chosen to match the current trainee. For example, an error made by a trainee who is using the system for the first time may require a verbose explanation to make certain that the new trainee will have all the knowledge and concepts needed to proceed with the training session. On the other hand, a trainee who has considerable experience on the system may have forgotten a particular procedure or may have lost his or her place.

However, Loftin merely discloses an error severity level that is based on the characteristics of the trainee and not on the response from the trainee. The Office Action also alleges that Loftin discloses “the appropriate training component being selected from a plurality of training components and based on **an amount contained in the associated response**.” (Emphasis added.) As alleged by the Office Action, Loftin discloses (Column 16, lines 31-43):

The training scenario generator relies upon a database of task “problems” to structure unique exercises for a particular trainee each time the trainee interacts with the system. Typically, the initial exercises provided to a new trainee are based on variants of a purely nominal satellite deployment. Thus, the nominal deployment does not increase the difficulty for the new trainee by including time constraints, distractions or related problems. Once the trainee has demonstrated an

acceptable level of competence with the nominal satellite deployment, the training scenario generator 20 draws upon its database 24 to insert selected problems into the training environment.

Loftin merely discloses material that is presented to the trainee is based on the experience of the trainee and not on the response from the trainee.

Also, as discussed above, Applicant is amending claim 1 to include the features of “(e)(i) determining the type of the feedback category for the associated response; (e)(ii) when the feedback category corresponds to an administrative category, instructing the student to provide a sufficient amount of work to assess a subsequent response; and (e)(iii) when the feedback category corresponds to an educational category, assessing the associated response in accordance with the educational category.” Loftin fails to even suggest an administrative category. The deficiencies of Loftin are not remedied by Rachlin. Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Loftin in view of Rachlin. For at least the above reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration of claim 1.

Applicant is similarly amending claim 10 to include the feature of “logic that evaluates progress toward the goal and provides a determined feedback having a feedback category based on an appropriate level of feedback and an appropriate training component that further motivates accomplishment of the accounting goal, the appropriate level of feedback being selected from the plurality of feedback levels based on an error severity of an associated response from the student, the appropriate training component being selected from a plurality of training components and based on an amount of work contained in the associated response, and further comprising: (e)(i) determining the type of the feedback category for the associated response; (e)(ii) when the feedback category corresponds to an administrative category, instructing the student to provide a sufficient amount of work to assess a subsequent response; and (e)(iii) when the feedback category corresponds to an educational category, assessing the associated response in accordance with the educational category.” Also, Applicant is similarly amending claim 19 to include the feature of “evaluating progress toward the goal and providing a determined feedback having a feedback category based on an appropriate level of feedback and an appropriate training component that further motivates accomplishment of the accounting goal, the appropriate level of feedback being selected from the plurality of feedback levels based on an error severity of an associated response from the student, the appropriate training component being selected from a plurality of training components and based on an amount of work contained in the associated response, and further comprising: (e)(i) determining the type of the feedback category for the

associated response; (e)(ii) when the feedback category corresponds to an administrative category, instructing the student to provide a sufficient amount of work to assess a subsequent response; and (e)(iii) when the feedback category corresponds to an educational category, assessing the associated response in accordance with the educational category.” Claims 2-9, 11-18, and 20 ultimately depend from independent claims 1, 10, and 19, respectively. Thus, claims 2-20 are patentable for at least the above reasons. Applicant requests reconsideration of claims 1-20.

It is respectfully submitted that the present patent application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 9, 2007



Kenneth F. Smolik
Registration No. 44,344
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606-7407
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001